



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the sub-contractor's employees (*Johnson v. Ott Brothers*, 155 Pa. 17). And in an analogous case the owner of a ship was held liable for the unsafe condition of the ship, *Perkins v. Furness, Withy & Co.*, 167 Mass. 403. A reasonable and logical method of determining upon whom the duty rests would be to place the duty upon the person in control of the place where the work was being carried on. Applying this test all of the above cases can be reconciled, the duty of providing the safe place to work in each case being upon the person in charge and control of the place where the work is being done. Under this test the conclusion of the court in the principal case is correct, but the language used in the decision is probably too broad.

MASTER AND SERVANT—SAFE PLACE TO WORK—QUARRIES.—Plaintiffs intestate was employed as a driller in the defendant's quarry, and was fatally injured by a loosened rock falling upon him from a bank or cliff above the place where he was working. *Held*, the general rule which obliges the master to furnish his servant a reasonably safe place to work does not apply to a quarry. *Miller v. Berkeley Limestone Co.* (W. Va. 1912) 75 S. E. 70.

The decision in the principal case is based upon the exception that the master is not under duty to keep the working place safe, when the very work which the servant is employed to perform changes the condition of the place and makes it more or less dangerous as the work advances. The cases to which this exception is most usually applied are those involving the various kinds of construction work. 2 LABATT, MASTER AND SERVANT 588 and cases cited. The great majority of the recent cases on the point do not place quarry work within this exception. Some of the cases hold that where a servant is employed in a mine, quarry, tunnel, etc., the master must use reasonable care to make his place of work as reasonably safe as the nature of the work permits. *Millen v. Pacific Bridge Co.*, 51 Ore. 538, 95 Pac. 196; *Brown v. Sharp-Hauser Contracting Co.*, 159 Cal. 89, 112 Pac. 874; *Schoenherr-Walton Mining Co.*, 136 Mo. App. 376, 117 S. W. 695. Other cases hold that it is the duty of the master conducting a quarry to provide his employees a reasonably safe place to work, and to this end it is his duty to inspect the wall as often as it is necessary to prevent injuries from falling rock or other substances. *Alabama Consolidated Coal & Iron Company v. Hammond*, 156 Ala. 253, 47 South. 248; *Roberts v. Jones*, 156 Mo. App. 552, 137 S. W. 639; *Maloney v. Winston Bros. Co.*, 18 Idaho 740, 111 Pac. 1080. The danger from loosened rocks being one which is not caused by the negligence or lack of skill of the workman, and one which the master can avoid by the use of reasonable care, there seems to be no reason why it should be the basis for an exception to the general rule.

MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS—EXEMPTION OF SCHOOL PROPERTY FROM SPECIAL ASSESSMENT UNDER STATUTORY EXEMPTION FROM TAXATION DENIED.—An ordinance of plaintiff city created special improvement districts for constructing sewers, etc., which districts included property belonging to defendant school district. Defendant resisted the efforts of the city to collect any portion of the cost of these improvements assessed against it, relying on Mont. Const. Art. 12 § 2 and Rev. Codes, § 2499, which in terms exempt from taxa-